

REMARKS

Favorable reconsideration of this application, as presently amended and in light of the following discussion, is respectfully requested.

Claims 1-20, 22-24, 32, 53-55 and 58-64 are currently pending. Claims 21, 30, 31, 33-52, 56, and 57 have been canceled without prejudice; Claims 1-20, 22-24, 32, 53-55, and 58-62 have been amended; and Claims 63 and 64 have been added by the present amendment. The changes and additions to the claims are supported by the originally filed specification and do not add new matter.

In the outstanding Office Action, the Examiner indicated that the IDS filed May 21, 2001, fails to comply with 37 C.F.R. § 1.98(a)(1); Claims 59-62 were objected to under 37 C.F.R. § 1.75(c) as being improper multiple dependent claims; and Claims 1-24 and 30-58 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by European Patent Application EP884905 A2 to Leppisaari et al. (hereinafter "the '905 patent").

Applicants respectfully submit that the IDS filed May 21, 2001, conforms with 37 C.F.R. § 1.98(a)(1). The IDS filed May 21, 2001 consists of a list of related cases. In particular, it refers to Application Serial No. 09/734,595, which is related to the present application. Moreover, Applicants submit that this information was submitted in a list as required under 37 C.F.R. § 1.98(a)(1). Accordingly, Applicants respectfully traverse the objection to the IDS submitted May 21, 2001, and request that the IDS be acknowledged.

Regarding the objection to Claims 59-62, Applicants respectfully submit that that rejection is rendered moot by the present amendment to those claims. Accordingly, the objection to the claims is believed to have been overcome.

Applicants respectfully submit that the rejection of Claims 21, 30, 31, 33-52, 56, and 57 are rendered moot by the present cancellation of those claims.

Amended Claim 1 is directed to a method of processing or transmitting a video including an object of interest, comprising: (1) capturing a sequence of images in which the object of interest occupies a fraction of each captured image; (2) tracking movement of the object of interest and selecting and extracting a region of each captured image including the object of interest; (3) compensating for changes in size of the object of interest in the sequence of images; and (4) coding only the selected region of each captured image, after compensating for changes in the size of the object of interest, to produce a coded region. Claim 1 has been amended to add the step of *compensating for changes in the size of the object of interest in the sequence of images*. The changes to Claim 1 are supported by the originally filed specification and do not add new matter. In particular, Applicants note that Claim 1 has been amended to incorporate limitations recited in Claim 30. Accordingly, Claim 30 has been canceled without prejudice.

Applicants respectfully submit that the rejection of Claim 1 (and dependent Claims 2-7, 59, and 63) are rendered moot by the present amendment to Claim 1. However, since Claim 1 incorporates limitations recited in Claim 30, Applicants will address the patentability of amended Claim 1 with respect to the '905 patent.

The '905 patent is directed to a method for producing, in a terminal, an image to be transmitted as image data. In particular, as shown in Figure 1B, the '905 patent discloses a system that includes a camera having a wide-angle lens so that a user fits in the image field, and which uses pattern recognition to search for a figure using a pre-stored image of the figure. The located figure is then extracted and transmitted. However, Applicants respectfully submit that the '905 patent fails to disclose *compensating for changes in size of the object of interest in a sequence of images in which the object of interest occupies a fraction of each captured image*, as recited in amended Claim 1. Rather, the '905 patent merely discloses a system in which the camera or the user moves vertically and horizontally

so that the user is positioned in the center of the image field. However, the '905 patent does not address the problem of movement of an object of interest (e.g., a user) towards or away from the camera, which leads to a change in the size of the object of interest in the image field. Thus, the '905 patent also fails to disclose compensating for such changes in the size of the object of interest. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that amended Claim 1 (and dependent Claims 2-7 and 59) patentably define over the '905 patent.

Independent Claims 8, 22, and 23 recite limitations analogous to the limitations recited in independent Claim 1. Moreover, Claims 8, 22, and 23 have been amended in a manner analogous to the amendment to Claim 1. Accordingly, for the reasons stated above for the patentability of Claim 1, Applicants respectfully submit that the rejections of Claims 8, 22, and 23 (and all associated dependent claims) are rendered moot by the present amendment to the independent claims.

Amended Claim 15 is directed to a method of processing a video including an object of interest in a sequence of images, comprising: (1) selecting a region of an image including the object of interest, wherein the selected region is larger than an area occupied by the object of interest by a predetermined amount, including when the size of the object of interest changes in the sequence of images; and (2) coding the selected region. The changes to Claim 15 are supported by the originally filed specification and do not add new matter.

As noted above, the '905 patent is directed to a method for producing an image to be transmitted as image data using pattern recognition. However, Applicants respectfully submit that the '905 patent fails to disclose that a selected region is larger than an area occupied by the object of interest by a predetermined amount, *including when the size of the object of interest changes in the sequence of images*, as recited in amended Claim 15. The '905 patent fails to disclose that subsection 62 is other than a fixed size, regardless of the size of the object of interest. Further, as noted above, the '905 patent fails to address the problem

that may occur when the object of interest changes size in the image field. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that the rejection of Claim 15 (and dependent Claims 16-19, 32, and 59) are rendered moot to the present amendment to Claim 15.

Claim 24 recites limitations analogous to the limitations recited in Claim 15. Moreover, Claim 24 has been amended in a manner analogous to the amendment to Claim 15. Accordingly, for the reasons stated above for the patentability of Claim 15, Applicants respectfully submit that the rejections of Claim 24 (and all associated dependent claims) are rendered moot by the present amendment to Claim 15.

The present amendment also sets forth new Claims 63 and 64 for examination on the merits. Claim 63, which depends from Claim 1, recites that the step of compensating for changes in size of the object of interest comprises scaling the extracted region of at least some of the images in the sequence of images. Further, new Claim 64, which depends from Claim 15, recites the limitations recited in Claim 20. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that new Claims 63 and 64 are supported by the originally filed specification and do not add new matter. Further, based on the asserted allowability of Claims 1 and 15, respectively, Applicants respectfully submit that new Claims 63 and 64 patentably define over the '905 patent.

Thus, it is respectfully submitted that independent Claims 1, 8, 15, 22, 23, and 24 (and all associated dependent claims) patentably define over the '905 patent.

Consequently, in view of the present amendment and in light of the above discussion, the outstanding grounds for rejection are believed to have been overcome. The application as amended herewith is believed to be in condition for formal allowance. An early and favorable action to that effect is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

OBLON, SPIVAK, McCLELLAND,
MAIER & NEUSTADT, P.C.

Kurt M. Berger

Gregory J. Maier
Attorney of Record
Registration No. 25,599
Kurt M. Berger, Ph.D.
Registration No. 51,461

Customer Number

22850

Tel: (703) 413-3000
Fax: (703) 413 -2220
(OSMMN 08/03)
KMB/rac

I:\ATTY\kmb\203's\203185us\203185US-AM1.DOC